

Guidelines and Criteria for the Submission of Short Papers at EGOS Colloquia

Short papers should focus on the main ideas of the later full paper, i.e. they should explain the purpose of the paper, theoretical background, the research gap that is addressed, the approach taken, the methods of analysis (in empirical papers), main findings and contributions. In addition, it is useful to indicate clearly how the paper links with the sub-theme and the overall theme of the Colloquium, although not all papers need to focus on the overall theme. Creativity, innovativeness, theoretical grounding and critical thinking are typical characteristics of EGOS papers.

Your short paper should comprise **around 3,000 words** (inc. references, appendices, and other material).

Submission deadline for short papers for the (main) 42nd EGOS online Colloquium hosted by the University of Bergamo, July 9–11, 2026:

- Tuesday, January 7, 2026, **12:00 CET**

The deadline is unchangeable and therefore **extensions can not be granted!**

Formatting your short paper

Your short paper should comprise **around 3,000 words**, according to the following format:

- Font: 12 pt, Arial or Times New Roman
- Margin left/right: 2.5 cm
- Line spacing: 1.5
- Use APA style for your citations

Do not use capital letters in your paper's title, unless they are proper nouns (e.g. "London", "Thomas"), quoted titles, or if it is the first word after a colon or hyphen. For example: *Mark Twain's "The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn": Summary, analyses, and quotations*. Do not write your title in ALL CAPS.

Please **state your name** (and that of your co-author/s, if applicable) + affiliation + email at the top of your short paper (because no [single/double blind] peer review).

Short papers should be submitted as a **pdf or docx file**. Please do not upload txt files!



Steps prior to uploading your short paper

- To upload a short paper, you must be a **registered user** on the EGOS website.
If you have never been an EGOS member, never uploaded a short paper for one of the previous EGOS Colloquia, or never attended an EGOS Colloquium before, you need to **register on the EGOS website**. Click [here](#) and follow the instructions. Once you have an EGOS member number and password, please **log in to the member area “MyEGOS”** and follow the instructions for uploading your short paper listed below.
- If you are an active (or former) EGOS member, **log in to “MyEGOS”** using your email [or your EGOS member number] and your password.

Uploading your short paper

You can **only upload one short paper** with your EGOS member number! If your short paper is co-authored and you have already submitted a (single-authored) short paper to another sub-theme, then your co-author (one of your co-authors, respectively) has to upload this co-authored short paper by using their EGOS member number. Please note: You may only appear as **co-author in a maximum of TWO further short papers!**

- In the MyEGOS section of the website, click on **Submit your short paper**.
- Fill in the form.

Do not use ALL CAPS for your paper title.

As the uploader, you are the main author. Add all co-authors (can also be added when submitting your full paper).

Upload your paper as pdf or docx.

- If you want to re-upload your short paper because you submitted it to the wrong sub-theme or have an updated version, you can do so until the deadline:

In MyEGOS, you will see Status: Edit your short paper

Click delete your short paper application.

Submit your short paper again.

If you have any further questions, please contact the [EGOS Executive Secretariat](#).



Sub-theme 57: Technology and the Organization of Fields



42nd EGOS
Colloquium
University of Bergamo
July 9–11, 2026
EGOS

Convenors:

Dzifa Ametowobla

Brandenburg University of Technology, Germany
dzifa.ametowobla@b-tu.de

Attila Bruni

University of Trento, Italy
attila.bruni@unitn.it

David Seibt

Johannes Kepler University Linz, Austria
david.seibt@jku.at

Call for Papers

This sub-theme brings together theoretical and empirical analyses of the link between technology and the organization of social fields. It addresses the role of technology in field constitution and change and the role of fields in the design, production, and use of technology.

The digital transformation has renewed scholarly interest in the mutual shaping of technology and society. Traditionally, organization scholars have mostly examined the relationship between technology and social relations on the scale of whole societies (e.g., Castells, 2010), or individual organization (e.g., Orlikowski, 1992). On the meso-level of analysis, they focused more narrowly on the role of technology in industrial transformation (e.g., Nelson, 1994) and economic value creation in ecosystems (e.g., Jacobides et al., 2018). As digital technologies increasingly shape all areas of social life, we propose that field theory promises broader insights into the transformation of social institutions and power relations. However, realizing this promise requires extending field theory to capture the role of



technology and non-human agencies.

In organizational sociology, the field concept has been used to study meso-level social orders comprising heterogeneous actors such as individuals, business and state organizations, social movements, communities, and crowds. These social orders have been called fields (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992), organizational fields (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983), issue-based fields (Hoffman, 1999), or strategic action fields (Fligstein & McAdam, 2012). Despite their differences (cf. Zietsma et al., 2017), all these concepts refer to areas of social life in which the interrelated actions of heterogeneous actors generate and are governed by shared (albeit changeable and often contested) understandings about the field's major purposes or issues, its actor positions and their power relations, and its relevant rules of legitimate action.

The organization of social fields has always been related to technology, although this has rarely been the focus of research, except in studies on fields that form around issues related to the development and production of technology (Garud et al., 2002) or around purposes that are heavily dependent on technology (Leblebici et al., 1991). However, we argue that the link between technology and field organization is much more general and further underlined by the digital transformation of ever more areas of social life. The control and use of certain technologies are linked to the constitution of field positions and power relations. Technical objects contribute to regulating social action, while themselves being subject to regulation. Technological infrastructures shape the interaction and mutual awareness between field actors, as they enable and partially regulate the flow of goods, people, money, and information across time and space. Due to this central role of technology in the organization of fields, the introduction of new technologies is often linked to field emergence and transformation, while new technologies tend to be shaped by existing field structures. Indeed, these dynamics are key to many aspects of the digital transformation ranging from the influence of digital platforms (Ametowobla & Kirchner, 2023; Seibt, 2024) to digital innovation (Hinings et al., 2018) and the rise of AI (Airoldi, 2021).

Despite the promise of the field concept for analyzing the link between technology and the organization of meso-level social orders, the topic is largely neglected by major field theories.

Bourdieu (1984) views fields as the materialized form of history, including the tools and machines used and the kinds of products consumed by actors in specific field positions. However, most work in this tradition focuses on actors' control over, access to and dispositions towards technologies (Christin, 2017; Ignatow & Robinson, 2017; Sterne, 2003), neglecting the structuring role of technology and their specific material properties (but Airoldi, 2021).



Institutional field theories similarly neglect technology. DiMaggio and Powell (1983, p. 148) argue that organizational fields are constituted by actors producing “similar services and products”. However, analysis of the link between technologies and fields is curtailed by the focus on legitimacy (Meyer & Rowan, 1977) and mechanisms of isomorphism (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). This is in spite of the argument that technology may itself be a source of isomorphism (Benders et al., 2006; Caplan & Boyd, 2018) or even constitutive of organizational fields more generally (Dolata, 2009; Leblebici et al., 1991).

The concept of issue-based fields (Hoffman, 1999) does not include technology at all. However, it has been well-documented that the development, introduction, or breakdown of technologies often constitutes issues around which fields emerge or transform (Dahabiyeh & Constantinides, 2022; Garud, 2008; Windeler & Jungmann, 2023). Moreover, communication technologies clearly influence societal discourses and thus issue formation and transformation (Davis & Beck, 2023).

In their theory of strategic action fields, Fligstein and McAdam (2012) mention that technological innovations may constitute external shocks that trigger field transformation or enable the emergence of new social space. This influence of technology has been shown in studies on sustainable transitions (Hess, 2013), digital platforms (Kirchner & Schüßler, 2020; Seibt, 2024) or living labs (Canzler et al., 2017), but hardly been considered systematically.

This sub-theme aims to advance our understanding of the link between technology and the organization of fields (1) by systematically integrating research on technology in the various strands of field theory and (2) by using field theories to analyze key aspects of the digital transformation, such as platformization, datafication and the rise of AI. Empirical and theoretical contributions may address questions such as the following:

- How can sociological field theories be extended to analyze the relationship between technology and field organization?
- What do different field theories teach us about the influence of technology on field emergence, stabilization, and transformation?
- How are new technologies shaped by existing field structures and how do fields and their technologies co-evolve over time?
- How can theories from different theoretical traditions (e.g., sociology, science and technology studies, information systems) help us analyze the link between field organization and technology?
- How does technology shape fields that are not primarily focused on the development, production, or use of technologies?



- What is the role of taken-for-granted technologies and infrastructures in the organization of fields?
- How do major developments such as datafication, platformization, or the rise of artificial intelligence shape field formation and transformation?
- How can field theories contribute to an understanding of the digital transformation that takes into account institutionalized rules, norms, and power relations?

References

- Airoidi, M. (2021): *Machine Habitus: Toward a Sociology of Algorithms*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Ametowobla, D., & Kirchner, S. (2023): "The organization of digital platforms: The role of digital technology and architecture for social order." *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, 52 (2), 143–156.
- Benders, J., Batenburg, R., & van der Blonk, H. (2006): "Sticking to standards; technical and other isomorphic pressures in deploying ERP systems." *Information & Management*, 43 (2), 194–203.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984): *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L.J.D. (1992): *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Canzler, W., Engels, F., Rogge, J.-C., Simon, D., & Wentland, A. (2017): "From 'living lab' to strategic action field: Bringing together energy, mobility, and Information Technology in Germany." *Energy Research & Social Science*, 27, 25–35.
- Caplan, R., & boyd, d. (2018): "Isomorphism through algorithms: Institutional dependencies in the case of Facebook." *Big Data & Society*, 5 (1), <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951718757253>.
- Castells, M. (2010): *The Rise of the Network Society*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Christin, A. (2017): "Algorithms in practice: Comparing web journalism and criminal justice." *Big Data & Society*, 4 (2), 1–14.
- Dahabiyeh, L., & Constantinides, P. (2022): "Legitimizing digital technologies in industry exchange fields: The case of digital signatures." *Information and Organization*, 32 (1), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infoandorg.2022.100392>.
- Davis, D.J., & Beck, T.E. (2023): "How social media disrupts institutions: Exploring the intersection of online disinformation, digital materiality and field-level change." *Information and Organization*, 33 (4), <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infoandorg.2023.100488>.
- DiMaggio, P.J., & Powell, W.W. (1983): "The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields." *American Sociological Review*, 48 (2), 147–160.
- Dolata, U. (2009): "Technological innovations and sectoral change." *Research Policy*, 38 (6), 1066–1076.
- Fligstein, N., & McAdam, D. (2012): *A Theory of Fields*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Garud, R. (2008): "Conferences as Venues for the Configuration of Emerging Organizational Fields: The Case of Cochlear Implants." *Journal of Management Studies*, 45 (6), 1061–1088.
- Garud, R., Jain, S., & Kumaraswamy, A. (2002): "Institutional Entrepreneurship in the Sponsorship of Common Technological Standards: The Case of Sun Microsystems and Java." *Academy of Management Journal*, 45 (1), 196–214.
- Hess, D.J. (2013): "Industrial fields and countervailing power: The transformation of distributed solar energy in the United States." *Global Environmental Change*, 23 (5), 847–855.
- Hinings, B., Gegenhuber, T., & Greenwood, R. (2018): "Digital innovation and transformation: An institutional perspective." *Information and Organization*, 28 (1), 52–61.



- Hoffman, A.J. (1999): "Institutional Evolution and Change: Environmentalism and the U.S. Chemical Industry." *Academy of Management Journal*, 42 (4), 351–371.
- Ignatow, G., & Robinson, L. (2017): "Pierre Bourdieu: theorizing the digital." *Information, Communication & Society*, 20 (7), 950–966.
- Jacobides, M.G., Cennamo, C., & Gawer, A. (2018): "Towards a theory of ecosystems." *Strategic Management Journal*, 39 (8), 2255–2276.
- Kirchner, S., & Schüßler, E. (2020): "Regulating the Sharing Economy: A Field Perspective." In: I. Maurer, J. Mair, & A. Oberg (eds.): *Theorizing the Sharing Economy*. Leeds: Emerald Publishing Limited, 215–236
- Leblebici, H., Salancik, G.R., Copay, A., & King, T. (1991): "Institutional Change and the Transformation of Interorganizational Fields: An Organizational History of the U.S. Radio Broadcasting Industry." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36 (3), 333–363.
- Meyer, J.W., & Rowan, B. (1977): "Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony." *American Journal of Sociology*, 83 (2), 340–363.
- Nelson, R.R. (1994): "The Co-evolution of Technology, Industrial Structure, and Supporting Institutions." *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 3 (1), 47–63.
- Orlikowski, W.J. (1992): "The Duality of Technology: Rethinking the Concept of Technology in Organizations." *Organization Science*, 3 (3), 398–427.
- Seibt, D. (2024): "Platform Organizations and Fields: Exploring the Influence of Field Conditions on Platformization Processes." *Critical Sociology*, 50 (7-8), 1323–1342.
- Sterne, J. (2003): "Bourdieu, Technique and Technology." *Cultural Studies*, 17 (3-4), 367–389.
- Windeler, A., & Jungmann, R. (2023): "Complex innovation, organizations, and fields: Toward the organized transformation of today's innovation societies." *Current Sociology*, 71 (7), 1293–1311.
- Zietsma, C., Groenewegen, P., Logue, D.M., & Hinings, C.R. (2017): "Field or Fields? Building the Scaffolding for Cumulation of Research on Institutional Fields." *Academy of Management Annals*, 11 (1), 391–450.

